

Is it still correct to differentiate between early and very early onset psychosis?

Lin, Ashleigh; Wardenaar, Klaus; Pontillo, Maria; De Crescenzo, Franco; Mazzone, Luigi; Wood, Stephen; Vicari, Stefano; Beavan, Amanda; Armando, Marco

DOI:

[10.1016/j.schres.2015.11.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2015.11.020)

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Lin, A, Wardenaar, K, Pontillo, M, De Crescenzo, F, Mazzone, L, Wood, S, Vicari, S, Beavan, A & Armando, M 2016, 'Is it still correct to differentiate between early and very early onset psychosis?', *Schizophrenia Research*, vol. 170, no. 1, pp. 211–216 . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2015.11.020>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

Eligibility for repository: Checked on 4/2/2016

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Manuscript Number: SCHRES-D-15-00603R1

Title: Is it still correct to differentiate between early and very early onset psychosis?

Article Type: Full Length Article

Keywords: very early and early onset psychosis, first-episode psychosis, schizophrenia, childhood onset, ROC-curves

Corresponding Author: Dr.Med. marco armando, MD, PhD

Corresponding Author's Institution: Children Hospital Bambino Gesù

First Author: Ashleigh Lin, PhD

Order of Authors: Ashleigh Lin, PhD; Klaas Wardenaar, PhD; Maria Pontillo, PhD; Franco De Crescenzo, MD; Luigi Mazzone, PhD; Stefano Vicari, PhD; Stephen Wood, PhD; Amanda Beavan, BSc; marco armando, MD, PhD

Abstract: Objective: It remains unclear whether very early onset psychosis (VEOP; ≤ 12 years of age) and early onset psychosis (EOP; onset 13-17 years of age) are homogeneous in their clinical presentation. We investigated the predictive value of age of psychosis onset for severity, functioning and demographic variation by: 1) comparing groups based on traditional cut-offs for age of psychosis onset, and 2) using receiver operating characteristic (ROC)-curve calculations, without a priori age of onset cut-offs.

Method: Participants were 88 (45 female, 43 male) children and adolescents with a recent onset of psychosis (age range=6.7-17.5 years; $M=13.74$, $SD=2.37$).

Results: The VEOP group had significantly shorter duration of untreated illness and untreated psychosis, and lower functioning than the EOP group. The VEOP and EOP groups did not differ significantly on gender proportion, urbanicity, psychotic diagnosis, family history of psychotic disorder, psychotic, depressive and anxiety symptoms or IQ. When applying ROC-curves to the lowest three quartiles of positive psychotic symptoms scores, the optimal age-cut-off was 14.0 years (sensitivity=0.62; specificity=0.75). For the highest quartile of functioning scores, the optimal differentiating cut-off for age of psychosis onset was 14.7 years (sensitivity=0.71; specificity=0.70).

Conclusions: Larger samples of patients, assessed at presentation and followed-up, are necessary to clearly examine clinical presentation and outcome as a function of social and neural development to better understand if the differentiation between VEOP and EOP is justified. This will aid the development of predictive diagnostic tools, more accurate prognosis prediction, and age-tailored therapeutic interventions.

Acknowledgements

Marco Armando was supported by a Brain and Behavior Research Foundation (formerly NARSAD) Young Investigator Award. Ashleigh Lin is supported by the NHMRC (#1072593).

Conflicts of interest

The authors have no conflict of interest to declare related to the content of this study.

Contributors

Dr Armando designed this large First Episode Comparative Study. Dr Pontillo, Dr De Crescenzo, Dr Mazzone collected the data. Dr Lin, Dr Wardenaar and Dr Armando analyzed and interpreted the data. Dr Armando, Dr Lin, Dr Wardenaar and Dr Vicari wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All contributed to and have approved the final manuscript.

*Role of the Funding Source

Role of Funding Source

None

Paola Dazzan
Deputy Editor
Schizophrenia Research

16 November 2015

Dear Professor Dazzan

Thank you for agreeing to consider a revised version of this manuscript. We thank the reviews for their useful suggestions and believe the manuscript is much improved with the additions suggested by them. We have addressed each of the reviewers' comments in a point-by-point.

In accordance with the Editor's comment, the manuscript has been revised. We have modified the title as following: *"Is it still correct to differentiate between early and very early onset psychosis?"* Moreover, we stated that schizophrenia is a syndrome, with the consequence that symptoms of schizophrenia should be considered as heterogeneous even within the same age group, by adding the following sentence at the beginning of the Introduction section: *"Schizophrenia is a heterogeneous clinical syndrome of unknown aetiology, comprising a number of psychopathological domains and patients vary considerably in which pathologies are manifest (Insel, 2010). In accordance with this definition, symptoms of schizophrenia are heterogeneous, even within the same age group (Carpenter & Buchanan, 1989). Besides the heterogeneity of the clinical presentation, some differences related to the age of onset (i.e. premorbid abnormalities, longer duration of untreated psychosis [DUP], poorer outcome) have been highlighted (Armando et al, 2015). Consequently, the need of age-specific research in the area of psychosocial treatments for children and adolescents with schizophrenia has been argued (Tiffin et al, 2013)."* (p.3). The final paragraph of the manuscript has also been amended to reflect the Editor's comments.

We hope that these amendments will also assist in addressing the comments of Reviewer #1. We disagree with his/her views on the relevance of this paper because these issues do need to be investigated. We note the comments of Reviewer #2 ("This is a very well-written paper with a clear and clinically-relevant rationale") regarding the questions addressed in this paper.

We hope that you will find this revised version suitable for publication in *Schizophrenia Research*.

Kind regards

Dr Marco Armando and Dr Ashleigh Lin

Title: Is it still correct to differentiate between early and very early onset psychosis?

Running head: Early and very early onset psychosis

Authors: Ashleigh Lin, PhD^a, Klaas J. Wardenaar, PhD^b, Maria Pontillo, PhD^c, Franco De Crescenzo MD^c, Luigi Mazzone PhD^c, Stefano Vicari PhD^c, Stephen J. Wood PhD^{d,e}, Amanda Beavan BSc^d, Marco Armando, PhD^{c,f}

^a Telethon Kids Institute, The University of Western Australia, 100 Roberts Road, Subiaco, 6008, Western Australia, Australia.

^b Department of Psychiatry, Interdisciplinary Center Psychopathology and Emotion Regulation (ICPE), University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, the Netherlands.

^c Child and Adolescence Neuropsychiatry Unit, Department of Neuroscience, Children Hospital Bambino Gesù, Piazza Sant'Onofrio 4, 00165 Rome, Italy.

^d School of Psychology, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, B15 2TT, United Kingdom.

^e Melbourne Neuropsychiatry Centre, Department of Psychiatry, University of Melbourne and Melbourne Health, Australia, Level 3, Alan Gilbert Building, 161 Barry St, Carlton, Victoria 3053, Australia.

^f Office Médico-Pédagogique Research Unit, Department of Psychiatry, University of Geneva School of Medicine, Geneva, Switzerland.

Corresponding Author:

Dr Marco Armando

Children Hospital Bambino Gesù, Piazza Sant'Onofrio 4, 00165 Rome, Italy.

Email: marco.armando@opbg.net

Telephone: +41 6 68592030

Text: 4135 words

Abstract: 244 words

Tables: 1; Figures 2

Abstract

Objective: It remains unclear whether very early onset psychosis (VEOP; ≤ 12 years of age) and early onset psychosis (EOP; onset 13-17 years of age) are homogeneous in their clinical presentation. We investigated the predictive value of age of psychosis onset for severity, functioning and demographic variation by: 1) comparing groups based on traditional cut-offs for age of psychosis onset, and 2) using receiver operating characteristic (ROC)-curve calculations, without a priori age of onset cut-offs.

Method: Participants were 88 (45 female, 43 male) children and adolescents with a recent onset of psychosis (age range=6.7-17.5 years; $M=13.74$, $SD=2.37$).

Results: The VEOP group had significantly shorter duration of untreated illness and untreated psychosis, and lower functioning than the EOP group. The VEOP and EOP groups did not differ significantly on gender proportion, urbanicity, psychotic diagnosis, family history of psychotic disorder, psychotic, depressive and anxiety symptoms or IQ. When applying ROC-curves to the lowest three quartiles of positive psychotic symptoms scores, the optimal age-cut-off was 14.0 years (sensitivity=0.62; specificity=0.75). For the highest quartile of functioning scores, the optimal differentiating cut-off for age of psychosis onset was 14.7 years (sensitivity=0.71; specificity=0.70).

Conclusions: Larger samples of patients, assessed at presentation and followed-up, are necessary to clearly examine clinical presentation and outcome as a function of social and neural development to better understand if the differentiation between VEOP and EOP is justified. This will aid the development of predictive diagnostic tools, more accurate prognosis prediction, and age-tailored therapeutic interventions.

Key-words: very early and early onset psychosis, first-episode psychosis, schizophrenia, childhood onset, ROC-curves

1 Introduction

Schizophrenia is a heterogeneous clinical syndrome of unknown aetiology, comprising a number of psychopathological domains and patients vary considerably in which pathologies are manifest (Insel, 2010). In accordance with this definition, symptoms of schizophrenia are heterogeneous, even within the same age group (Carpenter & Buchanan, 1989). Besides the heterogeneity of the clinical presentation, some differences related to the age of onset (i.e. premorbid abnormalities, longer duration of untreated psychosis [DUP], poorer outcome) have been highlighted (Armando et al, 2015). Consequently, the need of age-specific research in the area of psychosocial treatments for children and adolescents with schizophrenia has been argued (Tiffin et al, 2013).

In accordance with this evidence, a distinction has traditionally been made between adult-onset psychosis (AOP; ≥ 18 years of age) and early onset psychosis (EOP; onset <18 years of age), which occurs in approximately one-third of all patients diagnosed with a psychotic disorder (Madaan et al., 2008). While this cut-off is arbitrary, there is evidence that psychotic illness which begins before the age of 18 tends to be more severe than AOP (Rabinowitz et al., 2006; Reichert et al., 2008; Kumra & Schultz, 2008; Diaz-Caneja et al., 2015). Compared to AOP, EOP is more strongly associated with premorbid social impairments, DUP (Hollis, 2003; Schimmelmann et al., 2007), a more severe clinical course (Werry et al., 1991; Eggers et al., 1997), more severe premorbid neurodevelopmental abnormalities (Vourdas et al., 2003), greater genetic loading (Kumra & Schultz, 2008), and more severe negative symptoms (Pencer et al., 2005; Kao et al., 2010).

While the differences between AOP and EOP are well supported, there is still debate regarding whether EOP should be considered as a homogeneous entity. Most commonly, the cut-off of psychosis onset at or before 12 years of age is used; that is, EOP with onset between 13 and 17 years of age (sometimes referred to as adolescent onset psychosis) and very early onset psychoses (VEOP), with onset of illness at age 12 years or younger (often referred to as childhood onset schizophrenia). While many studies have investigated the clinical and neurocognitive features of VEOP specifically (see Kyriakopoulos et al., 2007 for a review), very few have directly compared the clinical characteristics of EOP and VEOP. Those that have demonstrate the long-term outcome of individuals with VEOP appears to be worse than EOP. These individuals do more poorly at school and are less likely to have been employed than individuals with EOP (Biswas et al., 2006). They have a longer first hospital admission and subsequently have a greater number of days in hospital each year (Rabinowitz et al., 2006). There is also meta-analytic evidence that anti-psychotic medication initiated at a younger age is associated with an increased risk of side effects,

particularly weight gain, higher discontinuation rates and leaving school early (Stafford et al., 2015). Evidence of neurocognitive variations according to age of psychosis onset is variable. Biswas and colleagues (Biswas et al., 2006) showed poorer cognitive function, namely IQ, memory and perceptuomotor skills, in individuals with VEOP compared to EOP. Conversely, Rhinewine et al. (2005) found no significant differences in the neurocognitive performance of VEOP and EOP groups, and no significant association between cognitive ability and age of psychosis onset.

In summary, there is still a lack of evidence of an ‘age of psychosis onset effect’ in youth <18 years of age. We lack the knowledge to determine whether psychoses with an onset before 18 years of age should be differentiated into VEOP and EOP, and if so, whether the traditional age cut-offs are clinically valid. A better understanding of this is important for the development of diagnostic criteria and age-specific therapeutic strategies. Indeed, the urgent need for studies investigating the role played by age of onset of psychosis on clinical presentation and response to therapeutic interventions has recently been highlighted (Schimmelmann & Schultze-Lutter 2012; Schimmelmann et al., 2013; NICE, 2013).

To our knowledge, no study has investigated the clinical and demographic differences between young people with VEOP and EOP *at the time of psychosis onset*. In the current study, we examined psychoses with onset before the age of 18 years by: 1) examining differences at presentation between individuals with EOP and VEOP according to the traditional cut-offs for age of psychosis onset; and 2) by using receiver operating characteristic (ROC)-curves to determine if there was a clinically significant cut-off for the age of psychosis onset in the current sample.

2 Methods

2.1 Participants and Procedure

Participants in this study were 88 (45 female, 43 male) children and adolescents consecutively admitted to the Child and Adolescent Neuropsychiatry Unit of the Clinical and Research Hospital Bambino Gesù of Rome with a recent onset of psychosis between 2012 and 2014. Patients had psychosis onset between ages 6.7 and 17.5 years ($M=13.74$, $SD=2.37$, median=14.1) and had no previous drug treatment for psychosis (typical/atypical antipsychotics). Specific psychotic diagnoses are listed in Table 1. Exclusion criteria were past diagnosis of psychotic disorder, traumatic brain injury or known neurological disorder, verbal IQ<70, and current drug or alcohol abuse. The participation rate was 95% of the consecutively admitted children/adolescents. Four patients (5%) were excluded because of the presence of an exclusion criteria (three due to verbal

IQ<70, one due to drug abuse). No eligible patient refused to participate. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Clinical and Research Hospital Bambino Gesù of Rome. Participants gave written informed assent and written informed consent was given by their parents/legal guardian.

2.2 Measures

Mental disorders were assessed using the Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia for School Aged Children Present and Lifetime Version (K-SADS-PL) (Kaufman et al., 1997). Psychotic symptoms were indexed on the Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS) (Kay et al., 1987). This 30-item scale is used to assess the severity of positive and negative symptoms of psychosis, as well as general psychopathology. Both interviews were administered to the participants and their parent/guardian. All participants were screened for autism-spectrum disorder using the Autism Quotient Child (Auyeung et al., 2008) or Adolescent (Baron-Cohen et al., 2006) versions, completed by participants and their parent/guardian. In the case of positive screening, participants were assessed by a trained clinician on the Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule- Generic (Lord et al., 2000). None met criteria for autism-spectrum disorder. Participants completed (via self-reported) the Multidimensional Anxiety Scale for Children (MASC) (March et al., 1997) to obtain an index of the severity of anxiety symptoms and the Children's Depression Inventory (CDI) (Kovacs, 1998) to obtain a global rating of depressive symptoms. Functioning was measured with the Childhood Global Assessment Scale (CGAS) (Shaffer et al., 1983). IQ was assessed with the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-III) (Wechsler, 1991).

Duration of untreated illness (DUI) was defined as the delay between the onset of the first psychiatric disorder and the onset of criteria treatment, following the methodology used by Keshavan et al. (2003) DUP was defined as the delay between the onset of psychosis and the onset of criteria treatment, following the methodology used by Larsen et al. (2001).

We documented any first-degree relative with psychosis. Nine participants had no available information on family history (eight due to adoption). Living in an urban environment within the last three years was categorized according to a population of $\leq 100,000$ or $>100,001$ (based on Dragt et al., 2011). Socio-demographic information were obtained from parents/guardians.

2.3 Statistical analyses

First, we divided and compared groups based on traditional cut-offs for age of psychosis onset: VEOP (onset of psychosis ≤ 12 years of age) and EOP (onset of psychosis 13-17 years of age). For

group comparisons on categorical data, Chi-square was used. Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U was employed for group comparisons of continuous data. Effect sizes were calculated with Cohen's d for continuous variables and Cramer's phi for categorical data.

To investigate the predictive value of age of onset for psychotic symptom severity and functioning, without using the *a priori* cut-offs between EOP and VEOP, ROC-curves were calculated. Traditionally, ROC-curves are used to evaluate the ability of a test to detect a golden standard disorder/abnormality. Here, the curves were used in a slightly different context to evaluate the prognostic ability of age of onset at different age cut-offs. Thus, instead of evaluating whether, based on an *a priori* cut-off value, a test-score predicted an outcome with sufficient sensitivity (SENS) and/or specificity (SPEC), here optimal prediction of the outcome was used as a criterion to select the diagnostically most relevant age of onset cut-off. This approach was chosen because: (1) it allowed for the identification of an optimal age of onset cut-off (age with optimal SENS/SPEC), and; (2) it provided insight into the general prognostic value of age of onset for poor outcome.

In order to identify the factors associated with the poorest functioning and most severe symptoms using ROC analyses, the highest 25% of PANSS scores were compared to the lowest 75% of PANSS scores (positive, negative and total), and lowest 25% of CGAS scores were compared to the highest 75% of CGAS scores. After calculation of the ROC-curves, the non-parametric area under the curve (AUC) was investigated. If the AUC was significantly different from 0.5 (=chance level prediction), the curve's SENS and SPEC coordinates were inspected to find the age of psychosis onset cut-off with the most optimal SENS/SPEC balance, which was selected based on the highest J-statistic (SENS+SPEC-1) (Youden, 1950). Finally, SENS and SPEC were investigated for the traditional cut-off between VEOP and EOP. Finally, univariate data was reanalysed using the age cut-off shown to be most predictive in ROC analyses. All analyses were conducted with IBM SPSS (version 22).

3 Results

3.1 Sample characteristics

The characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1. The distribution of age of psychosis onset is shown in Figure 1. Twenty-nine participants (14 female) were in the VEOP group (mean age of psychosis onset=10.97 years; SD=1.58). Fifty-nine participants (31 female) were in the EOP group (mean age of psychosis onset=15.11 years; SD=1.20).

3.2 VEOP versus EOP

Psychotic diagnoses and family history of psychiatric illnesses for each group are presented in Table 1. There was no significant group difference between VEOP and EOP in terms of gender distribution ($\chi^2=0.14$, $p=0.7$, $\phi=0.04$), urban environment ($\chi^2=0.003$, $p>0.9$, $\phi=-0.006$), diagnosis of schizophrenia as opposed to other psychotic disorders ($\chi^2=0.007$, $p>0.9$, $\phi=-0.009$), or a family history of psychotic illness ($\chi^2=2.21$, $p=0.14$, $\phi=-0.17$). The VEOP group showed a significantly shorter DUI ($p=0.005$, $d=-0.60$) and DUP ($p=0.03$, $d=-0.54$) than the EOP group. They also had lower CGAS scores ($p=0.048$, $d=-0.43$). In terms of symptoms, groups did not differ significantly on PANSS positive ($p=0.7$, $d=0.15$), negative ($p>0.9$, $d=0.04$), general ($p>0.9$, $d=0.09$) or total ($p>0.9$, $d=0.12$) subscales, MASC ($p=0.2$, $d=0.28$), or CDI ($p=0.3$, $d=0.22$). Similarly, IQ scores did not differ significantly between groups ($p=0.4$, $d=-0.08$).

3.3 ROC-curves

To investigate whether older age of psychosis onset was predictive of lower psychotic symptom severity and better functioning without assuming an a priori cut-off, ROC-curves were calculated using age of onset (range: 6.7-17.5 years) as a predictor variable (see Figure 2).

First, the AUCs for the ROCs with different outcomes were investigated to gain an overall insight of the prognostic value of age of onset for poor outcome. For the prediction of being in the lower three quartiles of PANSS total scores, the AUC was 0.63 and did not differ significantly from 0.5, indicating that total symptom severity could not be predicted above chance level by age of psychosis onset (95%CI: 0.49-0.78; $p=0.066$). Being in the lower three quartiles of PANSS negative symptom scores was also not predicted above chance level by age of onset, as shown by a low AUC that did not differ significantly from 0.5 (AUC=0.59; 95%CI: 0.46-0.72; $p=0.24$). For the prediction of being in the lower three quartiles of PANSS positive symptom scores, the AUC was 0.69 (95%CI: 0.57-0.80; $p=0.012$), showing that the age of onset was predictive of positive symptom severity. Inspection of the ROC-curve SENS/SPEC coordinates revealed that the optimal age-cut-off was 14.0 years. For this cut-off, the J-statistic was highest ($J=0.37$), indicating an optimal combination of SENS (0.62) and SPEC (0.75). In the final ROC-analysis, predictive ability of age of onset for being in the upper quartile of CGAS scores was evaluated. Here, the AUC was 0.68 and this value was significantly higher than 0.5 (95%CI: 0.53-0.82; $p=0.015$). This indicated that higher age of onset was predictive of better functioning. Inspection of the ROC-curve coordinates showed that optimal age of psychosis onset cut-off was 14.7 years: for this cut-off the J-statistic was highest

(0.42) and the optimal combination of SENS (0.71) and SPEC (0.70) was observed. These results indicated that age of psychosis onset was generally predictive of positive symptomatology and functioning, and that setting the age of onset cut-off at <14.0 and <14.7, resulted in optimal prediction of, respectively more positive symptomatology and poorer functioning.

The observed optimal age cut-offs were higher than the cut-off traditionally used to differentiate between VEOP and EOP (age of onset ≤ 12). This age cut-off showed very high SENS but low SPEC in the current analyses: SENS=0.81 and SPEC=0.29 for low positive symptom severity and SENS=0.81 and SPEC=0.25 for high functioning.

3.4 Secondary analyses

To investigate the validity of the cut-off of 14-14.7 years of age, univariate analyses were rerun dividing groups based on age of psychosis onset <15 (N=56) or ≥ 15 years of age (N=32). The younger group had significantly higher PANSS positive scale scores ($p=0.005$; $d=0.70$) and lower CGAS scores ($p=0.003$, $d=-0.65$), as would be expected from ROC analyses results. They also had higher PANSS total symptom scores ($p=0.42$, $d=0.48$) and shorter DUI ($p=0.004$, $d=-0.59$). There were no significant group differences on negative ($p=0.16$, Cohen's $d=0.35$) or general ($p=0.4$, $d=0.20$) subscales, DUP ($p=0.3$, $d=-0.29$), MASC (N=47 and 27, $p=0.097$, $d=0.34$), CDI (N=47 and 28, $p=0.8$, $d=0.05$) or IQ scores ($p=0.6$, $d=0.27$). In terms of demographic variables, there were no significant differences between the new groups in terms of gender distribution ($\chi^2=0.08$, $p=0.8$; $\phi=0.03$), urban environment ($\chi^2=3.35$, $p=0.067$; $\phi=-0.2$), diagnosis of schizophrenia as opposed to other psychotic disorders ($\chi^2=0.04$, $p=0.8$; $\phi=-0.02$), or a family history of psychotic illness ($\chi^2=1.58$, $p=0.2$; $\phi=-0.14$).

4 Discussion

In this study, we investigated whether psychosis with onset before the age of 18 years old should be considered a homogenous entity by examining 88 participants aged 6.7 to 17.5 years at the time of psychosis onset. This was achieved by comparing groups defined by the traditional cut-offs for VEOP (onset ≤ 12 years) and EOP (onset 13-17 years), and subsequently exploring the data using ROC-curves to identify the age of onset cut-off with optimal predictive ability, without setting any a priori cut-off. Traditionally defined groups of VEOP and EOP could not be differentiated based on demographic factors, clinical symptoms (including psychotic, depressive or anxiety) or IQ.

However, those with VEOP showed poorer functioning and shorter DUI and DUP. When data were explored using the ROC-analyses without *a priori* cut-offs, the optimal age of psychosis cut-offs to distinguish those with poor outcome from those with more favourable outcome were between 14 and 14.7 years, with lower levels of positive symptoms and better functioning being predicted by older age of onset. When used to predict poor outcomes, the cut-offs within this age range showed better SENS and SPEC than the traditional age cut-off of 12 years, which showed particularly poor specificity.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to compare the clinical characteristics of EOP and VEOP at the time of diagnosis with psychotic disorder and statistically explore the validity of traditional age of onset cut-offs. Rabinowitz and colleagues (2006) used linked population-based registry data to empirically investigate the optimal cut-off for age of onset of schizophrenia for the long-term course of illness. They found that psychosis onset \leq age 11 was associated with more days in hospital at first admission, and that psychosis onset \leq age 12 was associated with greater number of days in hospital each year.

In our sample, the traditional age of psychosis onset cut-offs for VEOP and EOP were not particularly useful in clinically differentiating participants at presentation. The VEOP group did not show significantly higher levels of positive, negative or total symptoms, or depressive and anxiety symptoms. One explanation for the lack of group differences is that the CDI and MASC are self-report and younger children may have difficulty recognizing and describing their emotions. However, this was not the case with the PANSS, which is administered by clinicians. In fact, ROC-curves calculations suggested that the null findings may be attributed to the age of 12 years being an inaccurate cut-off for clinical significance of age of psychosis onset, at least for positive symptoms. We found that the optimal ages for differentiating the lowest three quartiles on the PANSS positive scores from the highest quartile was 14 years, with older age indicating less severe psychopathology. This is the same age cut-off used by Biswas and colleagues (2006), who showed higher levels of psychotic symptoms in their VEOP group. In our sample, age was not useful for differentiating the severity of total or negative symptoms.

Reanalysis of the data using the age of psychosis onset cut-off of <15 or 15-17 years old demonstrated larger effect sizes for the PANSS subscales, DUI, CGAS, and MASC than using the traditional age cut-off, although PANSS negative and general subscale scores and MASC did not differ significantly between these new groups. The increase in effect size demonstrates that a clinically-relevant difference may be present, at least for some symptoms, and that the current study may be underpowered to detect some differences. The findings provide tentative affirmation that the

age of 15 years may be a more appropriate cut-off for detecting clinical differences in age of psychosis onset in children and adolescents, but more studies are needed to confirm this.

Better psychosocial functioning was associated with an older age of psychosis onset, evidenced in the group comparison and ROC-curve calculations. The EOP group showed CGAS scores which were on average six points higher than the VEOP group, a finding that was statistically significant. Additional ROC-curve calculations provided evidence that an age cut-off of 14.7 years was even more optimal, with relatively high sensitivity (71%) and specificity (70%) for the upper quartile of functioning. This cut-off was better than 12 years of age, which showed high sensitivity (81%), but very low specificity (25%) for CGAS scores.

More impaired psychosocial functioning in individuals with a younger age of psychosis onset is likely to reflect the impact of psychosis onset on the establishment of identity formation, social networks, and peer relationships, all of which are important developmental aspects of the transition into adolescence. Moreover, earlier disruption at school is likely to negatively affect academic performance and the behavioural experience of the school environment. Our ROC-curve analyses suggest that intervention for these psychosocial disruptions may be particularly important for those with onset of psychosis before approximately 14.7 years of age to improve long-term functional outcome.

In this study we also found that DUP and DUI were significantly shorter in the VEOP group than EOP. Previous literature suggests that psychosis onset before age 18 is associated with a more insidious onset than adult psychosis (Hollis, 2003; Schimmelmann et al., 2007). We propose that this may indeed be the case, but that in childhood (i.e. age 12 and earlier), parents are more vigilant and attentive to behavioural disorders or social difficulties, leading them to seek intervention earlier. This is in contrast to adolescence when young people typically develop a level of independence from their parents and it is more difficult to distinguish typical behavioural anomalies associated with being a teenager from early manifestations of psychotic condition. However, our data and this hypothesis are contradictory to a previous finding of more insidious onset of psychosis in VEOP compared psychosis onset at an older age (Russell, 1994). Given the well-established association between prolonged DUP and poor outcome, further research into the factors associated with DUP in children and adolescents is necessary.

There were a number of null findings from the comparison of VEOP and EOP. These included IQ, gender distribution, urbanicity, psychotic diagnosis and family history of psychosis. Similar to the findings of Rhinewine et al. (2005), our VEOP group did not have poorer IQ than the EOP group, whereas Biswas and colleagues (2006) found a significant difference between their

childhood and adolescent groups on indices of IQ. This discrepancy is likely due to the fact that cognition was assessed an average of over 12 years after illness onset in the Biswas et al. (2006) sample, whereas our participants were assessed at illness onset and those reported by Rhinewine et al. (2005) had an average illness duration of 4 years. Given that the progression of cognitive changes in VEOP and EOP are largely unknown, deterioration in cognitive ability may occur in the years following diagnosis.

While there is evidence of a greater proportion of males (Russell, 1994) and a stronger genetic loading (Kumra & Schulz, 2008) in individuals who develop psychosis before the age of 18, to the best of our knowledge, no study has compared VEOP and EOP these demographic variables. Our findings suggest that in demographic and diagnostic respects, onset of psychosis before age 18 is somewhat homogenous. When univariate analyses were rerun by dividing the sample into psychosis onset <15 years vs. onset 15- 17 years), there were no significant group differences on demographic and diagnostic variables, providing further evidence of homogeneity in these respects in our sample.

The strengths of this study are a rare sample of individuals with a low prevalence disorder and no previous drug treatment for psychosis. The sample was recruited from a hospital considered to be the Italian point of reference for the assessment and treatment of VEOP/EOP and is likely to be highly representative. This differs from many other VEOP/EOP samples, where referrals are often treatment-refractory patients from other medical centres. This study has several limitations. First, a sample size of 88 patients is not particularly large for ROC analyses, and we may have been underpowered to detect significant group difference. However, this sample size should be considered in light of the low prevalence of psychotic disorder in the age range investigated. Second, a full neurocognitive assessment was not conducted. Third, only a history of first-degree relatives was assessed. Second-degree relatives with psychosis may also infer increase genetic risk for the illness. Fourth, the cross-sectional design of the current study precluded the analysis of the possible role played by the age of onset on the longer clinical and functional outcome.

In summary, we found that the traditional cut-off for age of psychosis onset of ≤ 12 years for VEOP and 13-17 years for EOP were not particularly meaningful for describing the initial clinical presentation of this sample. ROC-curve calculations demonstrated that a more optimal age cut-off would fall between 14 and 14.7 years, particularly in terms of specificity for positive psychotic symptoms and functioning. We recognise that sensitivity of 62% and specificity of 75%, and sensitivity of 70% and specificity of 71% for positive symptoms and functioning respectively are not excellent prognostic values, particularly in light of the null findings for negative and general

symptoms. However, our aim was not to determine the best prediction, but rather to gain insight into the clinical significance of the traditional age cut-offs for VEOP and EOP, and explore if there was a more appropriate cut-off. Our results suggest more investigation is required. There is a need for more in-depth studies into the developmental features of psychoses with an onset in childhood and adolescence. Future research should incorporate a comprehensive neurocognitive battery and neuroimaging to characterise the association between neurodevelopment and age of psychosis onset. Follow-up of this sample will allow us to investigate later outcome in relation to age of psychosis onset, and the associations between early presentation and outcome.

There is a temptation to apply adult models of schizophrenia and other psychoses to children and adolescents. A clearer understanding of the age-specific aspects of psychotic disorder will aid the development of predictive diagnostic tools, more accurate prognosis prediction, and more effective and age-tailored therapeutic interventions. Indeed, the question of whether or not to provide specific age-tailored therapeutic interventions in patients who develop schizophrenia before the age of 18 years is still under debate (Armando et al, 2015; Tiffin et al, 2013). In accordance with the preliminary evidence emerging from our findings, we could speculate that the classical distinction between VEOP and EOP is not a useful tool. Psychosocial interventions to improve social and general functioning could be of particular usefulness under the age of 15 years old. The lack of relevant differences in terms of cognitive functioning, negative, depressive and anxiety symptoms, lead to a preliminary hypothesis that those symptoms and aspects of psychosis should be the target of any treatment, regardless the age of onset.

References:

- Armando M, Pontillo M, Vicari S. Psychosocial interventions for very early and early-onset schizophrenia: a review of treatment efficacy. *Curr Opin Psychiatry* 2015;28(4):312-323.
- Auyeung B, Baron-Cohen S, Wheelwright S, Allison C. The autism spectrum quotient: Children's version (AQ-Child). *J Autism Dev Disord* 2008;38(7):1230-1240.
- Baron-Cohen S, Hoekstra RA, Knickmeyer R, Wheelwright S. The autism-spectrum quotient (AQ)—Adolescent version. *J Autism Dev Disord* 2006;36(3):343-350.
- Biswas P, Malhotra S, Malhotra A, Gupta N. Comparative study of neuropsychological correlates in schizophrenia with onset in childhood, adolescence and adulthood. *Eur Child Adol Psychiatry* 2006;15(6):360-366.
- Carpenter W, Buchanan R. Domains of psychopathology relevant to the study of etiology and treatment of schizophrenia. In: Schulz SC, Tamminga CA, eds. *Schizophrenia: Scientific Progress*. New York: Oxford University Press; 1989:13–22.
- Dragt S, Nieman DH, Veltman D, Becker HE, van de Fliert R, de Haan L, Linszen DH. Environmental factors and social adjustment as predictors of a first psychosis in subjects at ultra high risk. *Schizophr Res* 2011;125(1):69-76.
- Díaz-Caneja CM, Pina-Camacho L, Rodríguez-Quiroga A, Fraguas D, Parellada M, Arango C. Predictors of outcome in early-onset psychosis: a systematic review. *npj Schizophr* 2015;1.
- Eggers C, Bunk D. The long-term course of childhood-onset schizophrenia: a 42-year followup. *Schizophr Bull* 1997;23(1):105-117.
- Hollis C. Developmental precursors of child-and adolescent-onset schizophrenia and affective psychoses: diagnostic specificity and continuity with symptom dimensions. *The Br J Psychiatry* 2003;182(1):37-44.
- Insel TR. Rethinking schizophrenia. *Nature* 2010;468(7321):187-193.
- Kao Y-C, Liu Y-P. Effects of age of onset on clinical characteristics in schizophrenia spectrum disorders. *BMC Psychiatry* 2010;10(1):63.
- Kaufman J, Birmaher B, Brent D, Rao U, Flynn C, Moreci P, Williamson D, Ryan N. Schedule for affective disorders and schizophrenia for school-age children-present and lifetime version (K-SADS-PL): initial reliability and validity data. *J Am Acad Child Adol Psychiatry* 1997;36(7):980-988.
- Kay SR, Flszbein A, Opfer LA. The positive and negative syndrome scale (PANSS) for schizophrenia. *Schizophr Bull* 1987;13(2):261-276.
- Keshavan MS, Haas G, Miewald J, Montrose DM, Reddy R, Schooler NR, Sweeney JA. Prolonged untreated illness duration from prodromal onset predicts outcome in first episode psychoses. *Schizophr Bull* 2003;29(4):757-769.
- Kovacs M. *Children's Depression Inventory, Questionario di autovalutazione (C.D.I)*. Firenze: OS Organizzazioni Speciali; 1988.
- Kyriakopoulos M, Frangou S. Pathophysiology of early onset schizophrenia. *Int Rev Psychiatry* 2007;19(4):315-324.
- Kumra S, Schulz SC. Editorial: research progress in early-onset schizophrenia. *Schizophr Bull* 2008;34(1):15-17.
- Larsen TK, Friis S, Haahr U, et al. Early detection and intervention in first-episode schizophrenia: a critical review. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 2001;103(5):323-334.
- Lord C, Risi S, Lambrecht L, Cook Jr EH, Leventhal BL, DiLavore PC, Pickles A, Rutter M. The Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule—Generic: A standard measure of social and communication deficits associated with the spectrum of autism. *J Autism Dev Disord* 2000;30(3):205-223.

- Madaan V, Dvir Y, Wilson DR. *Child and adolescent schizophrenia: pharmacological approaches*. 2008.
- March JS, Parker J, Sullivan K, Stallings P, Conners CK. The Multidimensional Anxiety Scale for Children (MASC): factor structure, reliability, and validity. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 1997;36(4):554-565.
- NICE. *Psychosis and schizophrenia in children and young people: recognition and management*. Clinical Guideline 155, London: National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence NICE; 2013.
- Pencer A, Addington J, Addington D. Outcome of a first episode of psychosis in adolescence: a 2-year follow-up. *Psychiat Res* 2005;133(1):35-43.
- Rabinowitz J, Levine SZ, Häfner H. A population based elaboration of the role of age of onset on the course of schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res* 2006;88(1):96-101.
- Reichert A, Kreiker S, Mehler-Wex C, Warnke A. The psychopathological and psychosocial outcome of early-onset schizophrenia: preliminary data of a 13-year follow-up. *Child Adolesc Psychiatry Ment Health* 2008;2:6.
- Rhinewine JP, Lencz T, Thaden EP, et al. Neurocognitive profile in adolescents with early-onset schizophrenia: clinical correlates. *Biol Psychiatry* 2005;58(9):705-712.
- Russell AT. The clinical presentation of childhood-onset schizophrenia. *Schizophr Bull* 1994;20(4):631-646.
- Schimmelmann BG, Conus P, Cotton S, McGorry PD, Lambert M. Pre-treatment, baseline, and outcome differences between early-onset and adult-onset psychosis in an epidemiological cohort of 636 first-episode patients. *Schizophr Res* 2007;95(1):1-8.
- Schimmelmann BG, Schultze-Lutter F. Early detection and intervention of psychosis in children and adolescents: urgent need for studies. *Eur Child Adol Psychiatry* 2012;21(5):239-241.
- Schimmelmann BG, Schmidt SJ, Carbon M, Correll CU. Treatment of adolescents with early-onset schizophrenia spectrum disorders: in search of a rational, evidence-informed approach. *Curr Opin Psychiatry* 2013;26(2):219-230.
- Shaffer D, Gould MS, Brasic J, Ambrosini P, Fisher P, Bird H, Aluwahlia S. A children's global assessment scale (CGAS). *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1983;40(11):1228-1231.
- Stafford MR, Mayo-Wilson E, Loucas CE, James A, Hollis C, Birchwood M, Kendall T. Efficacy and safety of pharmacological and psychological interventions for the treatment of psychosis and schizophrenia in children, adolescents and young adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS one* 2015;10:e0117166-e0117166.
- Tiffin PA, Welsh P. Practitioner review: schizophrenia spectrum disorders and the at-risk mental state for psychosis in children and adolescents--evidence-based management approaches. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 2013;54(11):1155-1175.
- Vourdas A, Pipe R, Corrigall R, Frangou S. Increased developmental deviance and premorbid dysfunction in early onset schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res* 2003;62(1):13-22.
- Wechsler D. *The Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-3rd ed*. San Antonio: Psychological Corporation; 1991.
- Werry JS, McClellan JM, Chard L. Childhood and adolescent schizophrenic, bipolar, and schizoaffective disorders: a clinical and outcome study. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 1991;30(3):457-465.

Authors and Contributors

Dr Armando designed this large First Episode Comparative Study. Dr Pontillo, Dr De Crescenzo, Dr Mazzone collected the data. Dr Lin, Dr Wardenaar and Dr Armando analyzed and interpreted the data. Dr Armando, Dr Lin, Dr Wardenaar and Dr Vicari wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All contributed to and have approved the final manuscript.

Declaration of interests

The authors have no conflict of interest to declare related to the content of this study.

Acknowledgements

Marco Armando was supported by grant from the Brain and Behavior Research Foundation (formerly NARSAD). Ashleigh Lin is supported by the NHMRC (#1072593).

Role of Funding Source

None.

Response to Reviewers' Comments:

We thank the reviewers for their scrutiny of the manuscript and insightful remarks, their excellent feedback on our study was very encouraging. We hope to match their thoroughness and detail in our reply.

Please note that our replies are written in italics and that any changes to the text are additionally underlined.

Reviewer #1: Thank you for asking me to review this manuscript. I am sorry to say that the study involves a non-question. The distinction of psychosis to early, very early and so on is and has always been an artefact of psychiatric service and training organization. By definition, different services and psychiatrists with different training would see these patients based on their age at presentation because of the division of services to pediatric, adolescent adult etc Schizophrenia at any age is known to describe a heterogenous population in terms of symptom profiles and most likely etiology. Does age of onset mean anything specific? Yes, it is an indicator of severity of brain dysfunction that is likely to be unrelated to any specific schizophrenia-related mechanism and likely to be accounted for by the very early disruption to development introduced by disease mechanisms. As in all of medicine, early onset of anything is associated with greater severity and greater dysfunction in all aspects of life. And obviously, the young you are when you go psychotic the more likely that someone will notice because children live in highly structured environments that include school and home where significant deviance is likely to be detected and acted upon.

Response: We have altered the emphasis of this paper to demonstrate the heterogeneity of schizophrenia and psychotic illness (see below). We note that this is not a comparison of adults and children with psychosis, but rather an investigation of the age of onset within a child/adolescent population. Little investigation has been conducted on the clinical presentation (and indeed degree of brain dysfunction) of individuals who develop psychotic illness within this population. Moreover, our findings suggest that within the child/adolescent population, younger children may not show a greater degree of brain dysfunction (as evidenced by equivalent IQ scores). We acknowledge in the text that a short DUP is likely to be the result of earlier detection by parents, but highlight that this finding is not consistent (i.e. EOP has previously been associated with a more insidious onset). It is our belief that investigations of this kind are necessary for informing psychosocial and psychological interventions.

"Schizophrenia is a heterogeneous clinical syndrome of unknown aetiology, comprising a number of psychopathological domains and patients vary considerably in which pathologies are manifest (Insel, 2010). In accordance with this definition, symptoms of schizophrenia are heterogeneous, even within the same age group (Carpenter & Buchanan, 1989). Besides the heterogeneity of the clinical presentation, some differences related to the age of onset (i.e. premorbid abnormalities, longer duration of untreated psychosis [DUP], poorer outcome) have been highlighted (Armando et al, 2015). Consequently, the need of age-specific research in the area of psychosocial treatments for children and adolescents with schizophrenia has been argued (Tiffin et al, 2013)." (p.3).

Reviewer #2: This is a very well-written paper with a clear and clinically-relevant rationale. As noted by the authors, this is a very under-researched group due to the low prevalence of early onset psychosis. I have only minor comments to the authors:

1. Methods: All data appears to be derived directly from the child patients themselves (except demographics presumably, although this is not specifically noted, could this please be clarified in the text where appropriate), were any symptom measures etc completed via parent-report? For this younger age group, parent-report might be helpful, if this is not available then worth mentioning in the limitations section.

Response: Information obtained via parents/guardians are very useful in this age range. The K-SADS, the PANSS and the AQ were administered to both patients and parents together. In order to provide this important information, we have revised the text as following:

"Mental disorders were assessed using the Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia for School Aged Children Present and Lifetime Version (K-SADS-PL) (Kaufman et al., 1997). Psychotic symptoms were indexed on the Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS) (Kay et al., 1987). This 30-item scale is used to assess the severity of positive and negative symptoms of psychosis, as well as general psychopathology. Both interviews were administered to the participants and their parent/guardian. All participants were screened for autism-spectrum disorder using the Autism Quotient Child (Auyeung et al., 2008) or Adolescent (Baron-Cohen et al., 2006) versions, completed by participants and their parent/guardian. In the case of positive screening, participants were assessed by a trained clinician on the Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule-Generic (Lord et al., 2000). None met criteria for autism-spectrum disorder. Participants completed (via self-reported) the Multidimensional Anxiety Scale for Children (MASC) (March et al., 1997) to obtain an index of the severity of anxiety symptoms and the Children's Depression Inventory (CDI) (Kovacs, 1998) to obtain a global rating of depressive symptoms. Functioning was measured with the Childhood Global Assessment Scale (CGAS) (Shaffer et al., 1983). IQ was assessed with the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-III) (Wechsler, 1991)." (p5).

2. Statistical analyses: The way in which the outcome variables are described is confusing and a bit repetitive, why not list all variables for which the lowest 75% were compared with the highest 25% and vice versa rather than repeat cut-offs for each variables? Some context here might be helpful, i.e., we wanted to identify the factors associated with the poorest functioning and most severe symptoms and therefore dichotomised variables as follows.....

Response: Thank you for highlighting this confusion. We have amended the text according to this suggestion as follows:

"In order to identify the factors associated with the poorest functioning and most severe symptoms using ROC analyses, the highest 25% of PANSS scores were compared to the lowest 75% of PANSS scores (positive, negative, general and total), and lowest 25% of CGAS scores were compared to the highest 75% of CGAS scores." (p. 6)

3. Statistical analyses/results: ROC and AUC statistics are not commonly used in this area of research and are often poorly described and misunderstood. It is therefore very important that the authors correctly describe these statistics and their meaning, not only in the methods, but also reiterated in the results and discussion. Also with regards to sensitivity and specificity, as these statistics are not used in the typical way in this study (i.e., to determine how well a screening test compares with a gold standard) it would be helpful to explain how these statistics are useful for addressing the aims of the current study and put their findings into words rather than just quoting the values. In the Results and Discussion sections I think the findings related to these analyses could be more clearly described.

Response: We agree that our use of ROC curves and the associated AUCs is somewhat different from how they are regularly used (i.e. evaluation of test vs. golden standard). We have therefore amended the Methods section to clarify our research goals and how ROC/AUC methods were useful to attain them. We have also added clarifications in the Results and Discussion sections. We hope that these made our aims and procedures clearer to the reader.

In the Methods section, we added the following text:

“...Traditionally, ROC-curves are used to evaluate the ability of a test to detect a golden standard disorder/abnormality. Here, the curves were used in a slightly different context: to evaluate the prognostic ability of age of onset at different age cut-offs. Thus, instead of evaluating whether a test-score predicted an outcome with sufficient sensitivity (SENS) and/or specificity (SPEC), here optimal prediction of the outcome was used as a criterion to select the diagnostically most relevant age of onset cut-off. This approach was chosen because: (1) it allowed for the identification of an optimal age of onset cut-off (age with optimal SENS/SPEC), and; (2) it provided insight into the general prognostic value of age of onset for poor outcome....” (p 5-6).

In the results section, we further clarified the text:

“...First, the AUCs for the ROCs with different outcomes were investigated to gain an overall insight into the prognostic value of age of onset for poor outcome. For the prediction of being in the lower three quartiles of PANSS total scores, the AUC was 0.63 and did not differ significantly from 0.5, indicating that total symptom severity could not be predicted above chance level by age of psychosis onset (95%CI: 0.49-0.78; $p=0.066$). Being in the lower three quartiles of PANSS negative symptom scores was also not predicted above chance level by age of onset, as shown by a low AUC that did not differ significantly from 0.5 (AUC=0.59; 95%CI: 0.46-0.72; $p=0.24$). For the prediction of being in the lower three quartiles of PANSS positive symptom scores, the AUC was 0.69 (95%CI: 0.57-0.80; $p=0.012$), showing that the age of onset was predictive of positive symptom severity. Inspection of the ROC-curve SENS/SPEC coordinates revealed that the optimal age-cut-off was 14.0 years. For this cut-off, the J-statistic was highest ($J=0.37$), indicating an optimal combination of SENS (0.62) and SPEC (0.75). In the final ROC-analysis, predictive ability of age of onset for being in the upper quartile of CGAS scores was evaluated. Here, the AUC was 0.68 and this value was significantly higher than 0.5 (95%CI: 0.53-0.82; $p=0.015$). This indicated that higher age of onset was predictive of better functioning. Inspection of the ROC-curve coordinates showed that optimal age of psychosis onset cut-off was 14.7 years: for this cut-off the J-statistic was highest (0.42) and the optimal combination of SENS (0.71) and SPEC (0.70) was observed. These results indicated that age of psychosis onset was generally predictive of positive symptomatology and functioning, and that setting the age of onset cut-off at <14.0 and <14.7, respectively resulted in optimal prediction of more positive symptomatology and poorer functioning. ...” (p 7)

In the Discussion section, we further clarified what our results:

“... When data were explored using the ROC-analyses without a priori cut-offs, the optimal age of psychosis cut-offs to distinguish those with poor outcome from those with more favourable outcome were between 14 and 14.7 years, with lower levels of positive symptoms and better functioning being predicted by older age of onset. When used to predict poor outcomes, the cut-offs within this age range showed better SENS and SPEC than the traditional age cut-off of 12 years, which showed particularly poor specificity...” (p 8)

4. Results: a very obvious follow-up question from the analyses is whether there are

demographic and/or clinical differences between groups when the ROC-defined cut-off is used (i.e., 14-15 years). That is, the authors conclude that the current age cut-off has little validity as there are few clinical factors distinguishing the groups, yet do not state whether their cut-off might be better. Later in the discussion it seems as though these analyses have actually been conducted and so I would recommend that these are quoted in the Results even if the answer is that they are not in fact better at distinguishing. This should also be discussed, i.e., why would the ROC indicate a different age cut-off that then can't perform better in initial analyses - is the study underpowered?

Response: As suggested we have included the analyses of the cut-off indicated in ROC analyses, as well as highlighting the fact that this study may be underpowered.

The following has been added to the Results section:

"To investigate the validity of the cut-off of 14-14.7 years of age, univariate analyses were rerun dividing groups based on age of psychosis onset <15 (N=56) or ≥15 years of age (N=32). The younger group had significantly higher PANSS positive scale scores (p=0.005; d=0.70) and lower CGAS scores (p=0.003, d=-0.65), as would be expected from ROC analyses results. They also had higher PANSS total symptom scores (p=0.42, d=0.48) and shorter DUI (p=0.004, d=-0.59). There were no significant group differences on negative (p=0.16, Cohen's d=0.35) or general (p=0.4, d =0.20) subscales, DUP (p=0.3, d=-0.29), MASC (N=47 and 27, p=0.097, d=0.34), CDI (N=47 and 28, p=0.8, d=0.05) or IQ scores (p=0.6, d=0.27). In terms of demographic variables, there was no significant differences between the new groups in terms of gender distribution ($\chi^2=0.08$, p=0.8; $\phi=0.03$), urban environment ($\chi^2=3.35$, p=0.067; $\phi=0.2$), diagnosis of schizophrenia as opposed to other psychotic disorders ($\chi^2=0.04$, p=0.8; $\phi=-0.02$), or a family history of psychotic illness ($\chi^2=1.58$, p=0.2; $\phi=-0.14$)." (p.8)

The following has been added to the Discussion section:

"Reanalysis of the data using the age of psychosis onset cut-off of <15 or 15-17 years old demonstrated larger effect sizes for the PANSS subscales, DUI, CGAS, and MASC than using the traditional age cut-off, although PANSS negative and general subscale scores and MASC did not differ significantly between these new groups. The increase in effect size demonstrates that a clinically-relevant difference may be present, at least for some symptoms, and that the current study may be underpowered to detect some differences. The findings provide tentative affirmation that the age of 15 years may be a more appropriate cut-off for detecting clinical differences in age of psychosis onset in children and adolescents, but more studies are needed to confirm this." (p 9)

".....When univariate analyses were rerun by dividing the sample into psychosis onset <15 years vs. onset 15- 17 years), there were no significant group differences on demographic and diagnostic variables, providing further evidence of homogeneity in these respects in our sample." (p11)

5. Table 1. Can the authors please add the associated statistics to Table 1 (i.e., group comparisons on demographic and clinical variables). In addition, might it be helpful to compute effect sizes (standardised mean differences and odds ratios). It looks like some of the differences are actually quite large but did not meet statistical significance - I think it would be worth taking a look at the effect sizes as this might just be a power issue.

Response: We thank the reviewer for this useful suggestion. Statistics and effect sizes are now included in text and in the table. Effect sizes have been calculated using Cohen's d and Cramer's phi.

Reviewer #3: This manuscript compares demographic and clinical characteristics in children with very early onset psychosis (VEOP ≤ 12 years) and early onset psychosis (EOP; 13-17 years), firstly employing the traditional cut-offs, and then using ROC curves to determine optimal age-cut offs for differentiating VEOP and EOP characteristics. The manuscript is well written, and the analyses appear to be performed competently. Main points for consideration:

1. As a non-expert in ROC analytic methods, I was left wondering whether the integrity of this analysis is susceptible to the poor distribution of cases in the VEOP group, and further, whether it is susceptible to the imbalance in cases between the groups (VEOP 33%; EOP 66%).

Response: The non-normal/irregular distribution of the age of onset within the VEOP group and across the VEOP and EOP groups, which were merged for the ROC analyses, is not problematic for the current analyses, because we used non-parametric methods that are not distorted by irregular/non-normal distributions of the predictor.

In the ROC-analyses we use age of onset as the predictor and poor outcome (as defined by PANSS scores) as outcome. For each cut-off on the age of onset predictor variable, the sensitivity and specificity with regard to the outcome were estimated. The SENS and SPEC for each cut-off were next plotted in the ROC curve. The AUC, which is used to judge the predictive ability of the predictor for the used outcome can be computed in different ways. One (parametric) way would be to fit a smooth curve through the coordinates and estimate the AUC under this curve. This AUC would be sensitive to distortions when the points in the ROC curve are not regularly spread out, as is the case in our study. We therefore used a non-parametric method to calculate the AUC. In this method, the points in the ROC curve are connected by lines and the exact AUC for the resulting (rather jagged) curve, is calculated using trapezoid formulas. The resulting AUC is estimated under distribution free assumptions. We clarified our use of non-parametric AUCs in the text (p 5-6).

2. The paper argues the importance of the topic on the basis of informing diagnostic criteria development and age-specific therapeutic strategies. These arguments could be better supported by the inclusion of outcome data on these cases (while this is acknowledged as a limitation, if the data is available, it should be included). Also, there is no discussion of how age-specific therapies would be targeted on the basis of limited differences in clinical presentation rather than age-appropriate tailoring based on capacity to understand psychotherapy materials etc.; nor is the case for pharmacological therapy distinction clear for \leq age 12 years vs. the revised recommendation of ≤ 14.7 years. In other words, the significance of the finding is relatively limited, particularly given that on the majority of clinical measures (e.g., depression, anxiety, negative and total symptoms) no differences were observed.

Response: We agree with the reviewer's comment. Indeed it would be very helpful to have longitudinal data on the outcome to give a better support to the current findings. Unfortunately, as stated in the paper, this data is not available at the moment. In order to highlight this limitation, we added the following sentence in the Limitation section:

"Fourth, the cross-sectional design of the current study precluded the analysis of the possible role played by the age of onset on the longer clinical and functional outcome."(p.11)

Regarding the second comment, we believe that the finding of a lack of relevant age-related clinical differences is a relevant finding in itself in term of treatment. Indeed, if these findings will be replicated and supported by longitudinal studies, the conclusion, as the reviewer says, would be that the same treatments should be provided regardless to the age of onset and that the only variable that should be taken into account would be the capacity to understand psychotherapy materials, etc. Nevertheless, we have added to the Discussion section with reflections on this important topic:

"Indeed, the question of whether or not to provide specific age-tailored therapeutic interventions in patients who develop schizophrenia before the age of 18 years is still under debate (Armando et al, 2015; Tiffin et al, 2013). In accordance with the preliminary evidence emerging from our findings, we could speculate that the classical distinction between VEOP and EOP is not a useful tool. Psychosocial interventions to improve social and general functioning could be of particular usefulness under the age of 15 years old. The lack of relevant differences in terms of cognitive functioning, negative, depressive and anxiety symptoms, lead to a preliminary hypothesis that those symptoms and aspects of psychosis should be the target of any treatment, regardless the age of onset." (p.12)

3. The method refers to consecutive presentations being included in the study, and exclusion criteria are listed. No information regarding the number of presentations and exclusions is provided.

Reponses: In accordance with the reviewer comment, we added this information in the text as follows:

"The participation rate was 95% of the consecutively admitted children/adolescents. Four patients (5%) were excluded because of the presence of an exclusion criteria (three due to verbal IQ<70, one due to drug abuse). No eligible patient refused to participate."

4. Only a history of first-degree relatives was assessed. Discussion needs to acknowledge this limitation.

Response: We added this as a limitation in the Discussion as follows:

"Third, only a history of first-degree relatives was assessed. Second-degree relatives with psychosis may also infer increase genetic risk for the illness." (p 4)

Minor points:

1. Table 1 clarity would be improved by the inclusion of subheadings/subsections (e.g., Diagnosis; Family History etc.) - presently, it is difficult to distinguish these related pieces of information from other variables.

Response: Thank you for this comment. Table 1 has been amended as suggested.

Table 1. Sample characteristics

	Full sample			VEOP			EOP			Statistics	Effect size
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD		Cohen's <i>d</i>
Clinical characteristics											
Age of psychosis onset (years)	88	13.75	2.37	29	10.97	1.58	59	15.11	1.20	p<0.001	-3.10
DUI (weeks)	88	67.94	38.51	29	53.07	35.76	59	75.25	37.98	p=0.005	-0.60
DUP (weeks)	88	29.33	19.39	29	22.45	14.97	59	32.71	20.50	p=0.032	-0.54
PANSS Positive	88	24.45	6.30	29	25.10	6.50	59	24.14	6.23	p=0.7	0.15
PANSS Negative	88	23.64	9.14	29	23.86	10.38	59	23.53	8.56	p>0.9	0.04
PANSS General	88	40.23	12.20	29	41.00	13.41	59	39.85	11.66	p>0.9	0.09
PANSS Total	88	88.16	20.57	29	89.79	22.94	59	87.36	19.46	p=0.9	0.12
CGAS	88	34.00	11.93	29	30.59	12.76	59	35.68	11.24	p=0.048	-0.43
IQ	88	87.72	19.90	29	86.66	19.05	59	88.24	20.44	p=0.4	-0.08
MASC anxiety scale	74	58.07	11.81	23	60.30	11.30	51	57.06	12.00	p=0.2	0.28
CDI depression scale	75	20.81	9.69	23	22.30	8.82	52	20.15	10.06	p=0.3	0.22
		N	%		N	%		N	%		Cramer's phi
Female Gender		45	51.1		14	48.3		31	52.5	$\chi^2=0.14, p=0.7$	0.04
Urbanicity >100,000		55	62.5		18	62.1		37	62.7	$\chi^2=0.003, p>0.9$	-0.006
Diagnosis											
Schizophrenia disorder		48	54.5		16	55.2		32	54.2	$\chi^2=2.21, p=0.14^*$	-0.009
Schizoaffective disorder		23	26.1		5	17.2		18	30.5		
Schizophreniform disorder		14	15.9		6	20.7		8	13.6		
Bipolar disorder with psychotic features		3	3.4		2	6.9		1	1.7		
Family history (FH)											
FH psychotic disorder		20	22.7		9	31.0		11	18.6	$\chi^2=0.007, p>0.9^{**}$	-0.17
FH non-psychotic bipolar disorder		11	12.5		4	13.8		7	11.9		
FH non-psychotic depressive disorder		8	9.1		2	6.9		6	10.2		
FH other psychiatric disorder		14	15.9		4	13.8		10	16.9		
FH unknown		9	10.2		4	13.7		5	8.5		
No FH		26	29.5		6	20.7		20	33.9		

*Diagnosis of schizophrenia compared to any other psychotic disorder, **Family history of psychosis compared to having family history of non-psychotic psychiatric disorder or no family history of psychiatric disorder.

Abbreviations: DUI, duration of untreated illness; DUP, duration of untreated psychosis; PANSS, positive and negative symptom scale; CGAS, Childhood Global Assessment Scale, IQ, Intelligence Quotient; MASC, Multidimensional Anxiety Scale for Children; CDI, Children's Depression Inventory; FH, family history.

Figure 1. Distribution of age of psychosis onset in the sample




Figure 2. ROC curves

